



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

57
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/828,003 | 04/06/2001 | Eiko Suzuki | 14467 | 5196 |
| 23389 | 7590 | 04/22/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC 400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530 | | | LE, BRIAN Q | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2623 | | |

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**SUPPLEMENTAL
Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

| | | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| 09/828,003 | SUZUKI, EIKO | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Brian Q Le | 2623 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-12.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the rejection of claims 5 under 35 U.S.C 112, the Applicant indicates (page 7 and 8 of the 'Remarks') the page 22 of the original specification show the support optical read conditions. However as indicated in the previous Office Action, the original disclosure does not show the interaction/relationship between the first read optical condition and the second read optical condition. The cited portion of the specification only shows the multiple read optical condition but no where it shows the relationship/interaction of the first read optical condition to the second read optical condition as disclosed in the claim language. Similarly to the claim 12, the original disclosure does not show the support of how the first ID interacts/relates to the second ID as claimed. Also the Applicant shows (page 9 of the 'Remarks') that page 18, line 9-page 19, line 16 shows the support of performing digital recognition processing of the first ID and analog recognition processing of the second ID. However, the cited location does not show the supported for the limitation of claim 12. Also, the Applicant cited page 22, lines 8-13 to show the support for claim language "highest score being adopted only if it is at least equal to a predetermined minimum score". The Examiner respectfully disagrees; the cited location does not show the support for this limitation. It merely shows the evaluation of highest score involving 70. However, it never discloses that 70 is the lowest/minimum score. Another word, 70 score can be a predetermined threshold but it is not necessarily considered as minimum/lowest score. Regarding claims 1-2, 5, 8-9 and 11, the Applicant argues (page 11) that Ono Satoru only teaches the evaluation score for one ID. However paragraph [0001], Ono Satoru clearly indicates this is a processing of more than one ID. Thus, there would be an evaluation score for more than one ID. Thus, all the rejections still maintained until the Applicant over the 35 U.S.C 112 rejections and the Prior Arts.



SAMIR AHMED
PRIMARY EXAMINER